**DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY (v.1)**

*DRAFT - NOT APPROVED BY COMMITTEE*

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD**
**RIVER AND PLATEAU COMMITTEE**
***June 12, 2001***
***Richland, WA***

**Topics in this Meeting Summary**


Introduction and Committee Business ..... 1
Central Plateau ..... 2
DOE-RL Response to Questions on Waste Management Strategic Plan ..... 7
Institutional Control Plan ..... 10
National Monument ..... 10
Plutonium Finishing Plant Update ..... 11
Spent Nuclear Fuel Update ..... 12
Spent Nuclear Fuel Management Transition ..... 12
Committee Work Planning ..... 13
Handouts ..... 13
Attendees ..... 14


*This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of ideas discussed or opinions given, and should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.*

## Introduction and Committee Business

Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues, opened the meeting by reminding committee members to sign the sign-in sheet. Then the committee adopted the previous meeting's summary, as none of the changes had been substantive. There were no responses to past advice to review. The committee discussed adding a rotating committee member to the Executive Issues Management Group's conference call, in addition to the chair, vice-chair, and relevant issue managers. This call has been hardwired for the third Thursday of each month at 3:00 pm; participants decide the agenda for the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) meetings and assign committee meeting times. Penny Mabie explained that once all five committees have decided their standing committee calls, EnviroIssues will send out a comprehensive administrative calendar, listing all standing committee calls and meeting times.

Dennis Faulk, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), announced that he brought copies of the official Public Comment form for the B-Reactor. Since the HAB issued advice on the B Reactor at its June meeting, the committee discussed whether the B Reactor should remain an active issue in its work plan. Issue Manager Madeleine Brown reported that the next issue to track is whether Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) milestones relating to B Reactor cleanup are met, and that the Public Involvement and

Communication Committee will work on developing advice on which stories should be told at the proposed B Reactor Museum.

Next the committee reviewed its work-planning table and assigned a lead issue manager on issues with multiple issue managers. The leads were signified with an "L" on the work-planning table, which will be updated and distributed to the committee.

Penny clarified how issue managers make contact with cross-cutting issue managers and agency representatives. A table, in HAB packets, lists all HAB members and the issues for which they are issue managers. To make contact with Department of Energy (DOE) staff, issue managers should contact Gail McClure's staff. For Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) and EPA staff, contact EnviroIssues. However, Ecology and EPA representatives present at the meeting listed the appropriate staff members for each issue on the committee's work plan; an additional column will be added to the table to reflect this information.

## Central Plateau

Penny Mabie introduced the next agenda item: a long-postponed discussion of the Central Plateau. She distributed a list of issues relating to the Central Plateau that had been identified by the former Environmental Restoration Committee.

### *Introduction and Process*

Issue Manager Gordon Rogers introduced Moses Jarassyi, Bechtel Hanford, who informed the committee about the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies' (DOE, EPA, Ecology) discussion of Central Plateau end states. On June 5th, project managers for activities within 200 Area from DOE, Ecology, and EPA participated in a workshop. Participants decided to involve the public and stakeholders, since these decisions could not be decided in one workshop. John Morse, DOE-RL, the Groundwater and Vadose Zone Program Manager, explained that the overall goal of the series of workshops is to reach and formalize an agreement between the three agencies on the exposure scenarios to support the feasibility study, analysis, and remediation of the Central Plateau. The plan is to generate a TPA "document in principle" by late summer 2001, which will then be reviewed by the HAB and the public.

Moses Jarassyi asked the committee for feedback on the following process: the TPA agencies will conduct technical workshops in which they address regulatory and legal details, then come up with a set of agreements (likely in the form of white papers) about issues to discuss, then return to the River and Plateau Committee (likely in early August), incorporate additional guidance from the committee, and finally formulate everything into one document. He expected another meeting for stakeholder input in mid-July.

- Wade Riggsbee offered to help the group take into account the Indian nations' guidance documents.
- Madeleine Brown reminded committee members of the Candy Land chart that HAB chair Todd Martin had presented at the previous HAB meeting, intended to illustrate the advice process. She was concerned about the proposed workshop

process treating the River and Plateau Committee as the full HAB. Committee members suggested scheduling a workshop to which all HAB members are invited, since the issue cross cuts across so many committees.

- Dennis Faulk suggested that the committee produce advice. He thought that the feedback of the broader public should be sought as well.
- The committee recommended the planning group study the previous advice on the HAB's website as well as recent decisions made about end states and closure for the Rocky Flats and Weldon Springs sites.
- Dan Simpson questioned independent regulation and asked if the group needed to follow DOE's checklist for this type of effort (old document number 4700.1).

**Committee discussion/questions**

- How will the long-delayed Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (SW EIS) affect this document? Did you consider any historical efforts? John Morse responded that the workshop had included a long discussion on the SW EIS, which is being considered in the process. The people involved in the SW EIS have been involved in the meetings regarding Central Plateau end states. The main issue is consistency with overall land use.
- Is existing data good enough for this evaluation? How will you monitor groundwater if the wells are all dry? John Morse answered that the reason for the workshop was feasibility. Data will be collected as the process progresses. Regarding the groundwater wells going dry, he said it is a pervasive issue on the site and DOE-RL is looking at it.
- How will risk be evaluated and folded into the model? The first step is to agree on exposure levels and then fold in the remedial decision process.
- Is there any guidance you have to follow other than the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)? Do you anticipate running into problems with that? John Morse answered that DOE-RL does anticipate hurdles, especially in the tank farms, but he thinks it will be able to resolve them.
- The committee questioned assumptions about future land use. John Price answered that the group needs feedback from the HAB on whether those assumptions are acceptable or not. A committee member thought it was clear that no one would grow root vegetables on the Central Plateau in the next 50 years, but asked what about the next 500 years?
- How is the effect on the environment measured? John Morse admitted that the group is still struggling with that question. Most likely it will develop a model of where contaminants go, which will involve a selection process of which species are most likely to be affected, since it is not possible to take all species into account.
- A committee member commented that in the past, a number of initiatives have looked at future uses of the 200 Area including the Hanford Future Site Uses Working Group. A report issued December 1992 identified a range of future use for six areas that had been considered for the vitrification plant. The Comprehensive Land Use Plan solved some specific problems, and there was even another plan between those. The commenter asked why this group was

starting over again. The response was that the TPA has specific milestones requiring specific regulatory direction soon (200-CS-1 Operable Unit proposal) and DOE-RL would like to get it right the first time.

**Regulator Perspectives**

**Ecology**

- John Price, the Environmental Restoration Project Manager, reported that Ecology is interested in defining end states and future uses. He thinks this will be established as specific time periods, leading to the question of what controls should exist in those time periods. Ecology's interests are in protecting human health and the environment; there has been a lot of emphasis on environment lately.
- Regarding the TPA, Ecology does not recognize DOE programs as having regulatory standing, just DOE as a whole. Ecology wants to provide a consistent regulatory program to DOE.
- Ecology would like to answer the following questions: What are the future uses of the Central Plateau? What are the issues, and how will those uses be formalized in a regulatory sense?
- John Price added that currently most cleanup is undertaken as interim remedial action, meaning it is not being excessively studied but instead just cleaned up.

**EPA**

- The committee asked whether a permit or license would be issued to cover the whole Central Plateau. Dennis Faulk, EPA, answered that no blanket permit will be issued over the whole plateau; there will be permits for smaller projects. The EPA still establishes individual systems under Superfund. He noted that consistent guidance is lacking.
- A committee member brought up the Institutional Control Plan, which will be available in draft form by the end of July but not finalized until the end of the fiscal year. Dennis responded that the Institutional Control Plan only covers the areas that EPA has control over. For the Central Plateau end states document, he advocates an "Agreement in principle" so every affected program plays by the same rules.
- Dennis commented that the Future Site Uses Working Group Report is still the backbone for establishing end states on the Central Plateau. This report, from 1992, created three timeframes: 1) Active waste management extending approximately to 2050; 2) A 100-year timeframe (extending until 2150) during which active controls would be in place; and 3) After 2150, in which people might forget about Hanford. He urged discussion of whether those were the correct timeframes, and if so, to define who and what would be protected in each.
- The EPA needs a systematic approach for the Central Plateau. There also must be consistency between DOE and regulatory programs, especially since the regulators set the standards.
- The plan needs to deal forcefully with groundwater, since the EPA 5-year review showed that groundwater is not being adequately addressed.

***Assumptions***

Moses discussed the working list of seven "baseline assumptions" produced by workshop participants. The committee focused its discussion on Numbers 2-4: 2) Site conditions will be phased over 3 time periods – active cleanup, active institutional controls, passive control. 3) There will be three geographic zones of land use: Core area, Buffer zone, and outside buffer zone. 4) To determine impacts on groundwater and the surface, there would be a minimum of four points of calculations/compliance – the facility, the boundary of the core area (marked with fences), the boundary of buffer zone, and the Columbia River.

Moses introduced a matrix (see Handout "Central Plateau Exposure Scenarios Matrix"). The matrix lists cleanup phases across the top, each subdivided into surface and ground water. Across the side, Future Conditions and Scenario were listed, each subdivided into Core, Buffer, and Outside Buffer. Moses clarified that the Core is the 200 Areas within the fence, probably including the vitrification plant. The Buffer zone will be an area of restricted public access to protect the public from contaminants within the Core area. Once waste management has been completed and the institutional controls are in place, the conditions of the site in area at that point in time must be decided.

**Assumption 2 -- Lengths of time for the three phases**

- The committee felt that the length of the three phases would vary depending on the future use scenario and the waste type; members advocated picking a condition then back-calculating how long it will take to reach that condition.
- The committee discussed lengths of time for each clean up phase. John Morse reported that Savannah River has maintained perpetual active control of its site, while other sites assume control for 500 years. The committee questioned the realism of planning for 500 years into the future. Dennis Faulk pointed out that workshop participants had assumed that active Institutional Controls would exist for 150 years from now because after that there would not be a way of keeping people off Hanford.
- A committee member suggested a fourth time period: No hazard, so no controls at all. Dennis Faulk thought passive controls and no controls were the same.
- Another committee member supported the existing time periods because historically humans have not been able to make predictions beyond 150 years. She would rather assume a more rigorous time frame to compel faster cleanup.
- A committee member suggested that the Active Waste Management category include closure.
- The committee asked Moses how the group defines scenarios in which remediation technology does not yet exist. He answered that that concern is addressed under CERCLA; the five-year review requires a continual evaluation of the effectiveness of technologies.
- A committee member expressed worry that accepting an interim period may allow the future DOE to end cleanup.
- John Price discussed the trade offs in cleaning up radioactive waste. Radioactivity decays, so contamination decreases as time proceeds. Thus, the shorter the time frame, the more remediation is necessary. He noted that capping

causes a drastic, disruptive environmental impact, which must be considered if the overall goal is to protect the environment.

- A committee member expressed concern that future users might demand specific land uses too soon, which would drive up the cost of cleanup.
- The committee brought up the fact that existing plans assume that some of Hanford's waste will be shipped elsewhere in the DOE complex, but in reality the waste may remain on site and Hanford may be forced to accept waste from other DOE sites. Such scenarios would increase the size of the Core and Buffer areas. The committee agreed that DOE-RL has very little influence on decisions made at other sites. Dennis Faulk pointed out that assuming the waste would always be on the site means cleanup will be more relaxed.
- A committee member expressed concern about the Columbia River, given the increasing need in the nation for irrigation water. She was specifically concerned that in the future there might be irrigation of Hanford.

**Assumption 3 – End state geographic areas**

- A committee member proposed four areas: Core, two buffers, and outside the buffer zone. The first buffer would be a specified geographic distance from the fence around the core area. The second buffer would be for contaminants for which remediation technology does not exist.
- The committee pointed out the need to consider areas of Hanford being added to the Hanford Reach National Monument (which solves many potential land use problems) and the need to take a careful look at intruder scenarios.
- The committee observed that buffer zones would need to be irregularly shaped. Moses agreed and added that buffer zones would include all ancillary structures. A committee member pointed out that the buffer zone might change over time, depending on how plumes proceed.
- The Future Site Uses Working Group defined the core area as inside fences and the pipes between areas. The committee had concerns about changing the buffer area to account for habitat lost in the fire. Moses reported that the group plans to do a survey of all 200 Area studies and data to locate gaps in the ecological understanding.
- The committee mentioned that since the contamination in some areas is growing, a buffer around them must be able to grow as well.

**Assumption 4 -- Groundwater and surface**

- Does surface water include everything down to ground water? Yes.
- Is the vadose zone being considered? Yes, but it is included in the four defined points.
- What is known about contaminants entering the Columbia River? What if carbon tetrachloride reaches Portland? John Morse responded that it would be diluted enough by Portland to not be harmful. There is ongoing monitoring of the river from the site all the way to Portland.
- The committee commented that the Columbia River Comprehensive Impact Assessment (CRCIA) has worked on tracking contaminants. John Morse said that there are ongoing programs for sampling.

- Has there been any discussion on airborne pollutants? Dennis Faulk and John Price both assured the committee that there would be.

Moses commented that the group would need to be very clear about the terms it uses. The committee discussed aiming specific advice about the SW EIS delay to DOE-Headquarters. It decided to track the response from its previous advice as well as resubmit the advice sent to Carolyn Huntoon with a new cover letter addressed to Jesse Roberson. The committee expressed congratulations to Moses and his group for taking on this project.

**DOE-RL Response to Questions on Waste Management Strategic Plan**

Beth Bilson, DOE-RL, announced that DOE-RL managers are being reorganized to reflect the intended cleanup outcomes. Beth Bilson will work on closing the River Corridor and Pete Knollmeyer will focus on the Central Plateau (including waste management).

On behalf of George Sanders, who could not attend due to sickness, Beth presented responses to the committee's questions about the DOE-RL Waste Management Strategic Plan (WMSP). She distributed a document in which the questions and responses were listed (see handout "Draft Responses to HAB RPC Comments on the February 2001 Hanford Waste Management Strategic Plan"). Pete Knollmeyer was also present to answer non-Waste Management Strategic Plan questions.

Beth briefly summarized DOE-RL's response to each question, noting that the full response could be found in the handout. Key points are listed below:

1. This question is outside the scope of the WMSP, which only examines where waste will go. DOE-RL is very serious about these questions; Pete Knollmeyer will be answering these questions as part of a project execution plan. In addition, some of these questions may be answered in the Institutional Control Plan and Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP).
2. This level of detail will be in more detailed waste-specific Project Management Plans.
3. The WMSP focuses on waste streams, not facilities. Closure of Treatment, Storage, and Disposal (TSD) facilities is covered by RCRA closure process and the WMSP does not refer to specifics about the closure. Adding TSDs into the WMSP is a possibility.
4. Regarding the removal of waste from Hanford, Beth reported that the WMSP addresses the transfer of transuranic (TRU) waste to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). High-level tank waste is not in the scope of the WMSP, which Beth admitted is a weakness of the plan, although it does include low level waste generated by the tank waste facility. Non-radioactive hazardous waste is not in the WMSP because its treatment is a routine activity. However, it could be added.

5. Off-site waste receipt is incorporated in the WMSP based on current forecasts. Waste acceptance criteria are set by a Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Record of Decision (ROD). A Programmatic EIS would list other waste.
    - The committee asked for an explanation of the Programmatic EIS. Beth explained that several years ago a Record of Decision (ROD) for a Waste Management Programmatic EIS laid in place DOE's plans for all the waste streams. This document says Hanford will move all TRU to WIPP and that Hanford could receive low level and mixed waste from all over the DOE complex. DOE-RL will not make any changes until it receives the EIS from DOE-Headquarters (DOE-HQ), which controls all major National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents.
    - What are the dates associated with these decisions? Rocky Flats needs to send its waste by 2003, although it has several alternatives of where to send the waste – commercial disposal, Hanford, or Nevada.
    - Can DOE-RL use the HAB's recent advice about not accepting off-site waste? Yes, it was good advice and DOE-RL is having more success than it has had before, but there are larger issues in the nation to consider.
    - What waste needs to come to Hanford and where will it go? DOE-RL does not want to build trenches. It made a commitment not to bring offsite waste to Hanford without fully notifying the State.
    - Are you considering reopening the scoping on the EIS? DOE-RL would prefer not to open the scope if it can get public comment before the draft is out.
    - Does the delay of the EIS imply that interim actions would be taken on the burial grounds? DOE-RL is not expecting any additional delays. Beth would like to figure out how to avoid digging trenches in the interim.

6. Regarding the impact of liquid effluent disposal on groundwater remediation, Beth reported that no impact on groundwater remediation efforts is anticipated.
7. Most Environmental Restoration waste goes to the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF), which is not included in the WMSP. The tank farm generates personal protective gear as a low-level waste, which will be incorporated into other waste streams.
8. The M-91 facilities will support Remote Handled TRU waste cleanup requirements and Contact Handled TRU processing that Waste Receiving and Processing (WRAP) cannot provide. The M-91 facilities will be sized to accommodate forecasted volumes and treatment requirements; details will be in the Project Management Plans.
9. Risk assessment is covered by other documents. Performance assessments address the risk to the public from disposal facilities. Authorization Basis is the sum of all requirements a facility has to meet.
10. The regulatory strategy for Environmental Safety and Health depends on which facility has which license, permit, etc. The WMSP is not designed to address these issues by facility.

11. There is a contingency plan if funding to implement the WMSP is not met. The intent of the WMSP was to be more of a planning tool.
    - Currently Hanford accepts off-site waste; is there a mechanism to get money for that? DOE-RL cannot ask for the same money twice from Congress. The Inspector General's audit is making recommendations that disposal sites should be funded on a national basis. In essence, the funds pay for the cost of digging a trench, not any future costs, so future storage costs may compete for funds intended for Hanford cleanup.
12. The WMSP is a tool for planning and discussing new goals and milestones with the regulators. It will help DOE-RL make intelligent decisions on funding, facility size and siting. DOE-RL's strategy for reconciling the WMSP schedules with TPA milestones is to meet the milestones, unless doing so does not make sense; in that case DOE-RL will propose changes.

***Regulator Perspective***

**Ecology**

Fred Jamison, Ecology, reported that the WMSP provides a good framework for laying out the waste streams that M-91 needs to address. Ecology would like to see reconciliation between TPA milestones and dates and for the Waste Management program to be consistent with other end states identified. In addition, Ecology wants to make sure that 1) all wastes are identified, and 2) all parties understand the technology involved. Ecology is concerned because the Waste Management program funding tends to get squeezed.

**EPA**

Dennis Faulk commented that EPA gets involved when CERCLA is involved. He added that EPA tries to make it difficult to get offsite waste onto Hanford.

***Committee discussion***

- The committee observed that one of the biggest problems appears to be funding for the Waste Management Program, so members discussed offering programmatic prioritizations in a non-budgetary context. Beth Bilson commented that DOE-RL would appreciate that advice.
- Dennis Faulk suggested that prioritizing facilities (i.e., the Effluent Treatment Facility might have priority over other buildings) would provide prioritization information about when to build which trench.
- The committee concluded that it would like to have a discussion, if not a conclusion, about prioritization.
- Shelley Cimon commented that DOE-RL's response was a very acronym-laden document. Beth promised to produce an acronym-free document.

Issue Manager Dan Simpson thanked DOE-RL for the response and asked if an update could be provided annually. Beth agreed to the request and added that she will make sure the committee's comments are incorporated into other documents. The committee decided the issue had been satisfactorily addressed and could be moved into a monitoring status.

## Institutional Control Plan

Jim Daily, DOE-RL, reported that the 100 Area ROD called for a site-wide Institutional Control Plan and an National Priorities List (NPL) specific control plan. Appendix A of the Institutional Control Plan is in two parts – site-wide and NPL-specific (see handout titled "100 Area NPL Section Outline"). DOE-RL is on track to finish a deliverable covering all the NPLs to the EPA by the end of July. Then there will be a 45-day comment period. Issue Manager Susan Leckband pointed out that the Institutional Control Plan is just the beginning of the Long Term Stewardship document. Jim Daily explained that DOE-HQ requires a Site Specific Long Term Stewardship plan by 2004, so DOE-RL is staggering its products: first it will write the Institutional Control plan, then the Long Term Stewardship plan, then an update to the DOE-RL strategic plan.

Shelley Cimon again pointed out the heavy use of acronyms in the handout. Dennis explained that it was originally an internal EPA document.

## National Monument

Greg Hughes, Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), and Dana Ward, DOE-RL, described the boundaries of the Hanford Reach National Monument. Essentially, a line was drawn on a map in Washington, D.C. and the land has not been physically surveyed yet.

DOE is directed by a Presidential memorandum (dated January 9, 2000) to clean the Hanford site's central area (including the expanded 200 Areas) to the regulatory requirements of EPA and Ecology. The FWS has requested that DOE also consider FWS land acquisition policy in its cleanup standards, which could require additional contaminate removal. The FWS has a mandate not to accept any contaminated lands, so within the monument there are pockets of contaminated areas still owned by DOE. Dana Ward explained that cleanup money has to go to Hanford's big problems; if funding becomes available, the contaminated pockets will be cleaned. Greg added that there might actually be documentation that some of those pockets are appropriately clean, but either there is not enough information or it is a daunting paper search that FWS currently lacks the budget and personnel to pursue.

The FWS is required to write a Comprehensive Conservation Plan (CCP), which must be updated every 15 years. The FWS will write it with the cooperation of DOE, which will contribute expertise (2 Full Time Equivalents) and approve the draft and final plan. A thirteen-member committee is writing the plan, which will take about three years to complete. DOE will probably be the underlying landowner for a long time so must be involved. DOE's commitment to its cleanup mission will be a major focus of the CCP. DOE and FWS have been working together on a Memorandum of Understanding that will outline how the two agencies will work together.

***Committee discussion/questions***

- Is the B Reactor within the National Monument? No.
- Are there other reactors inside the boundary? Yes, some bits are.

- Madeleine Brown, Issue Manager for the B Reactor, wanted verification of an earlier statement from Jamie Ziesloff, DOE-RL, that the B Reactor could be added to the refuge later. Dana Ward answered that areas DOE cleans up could be added to the Saddle Mountain wild life refuge. Greg added that the Hanford site contains multiple jurisdictions. Overlaying lands in this way is common, but Hanford is unique by having so many jurisdictions.
- Will the nuclear zone ever be clean enough to be added to the Monument? Greg answered that contaminated zones will be managed by DOE. The FWS has to be careful not to be held liable for cleanup. It may be possible to enact legislation that would protect the FWS from litigation; this was done for the Rocky Mountain arsenal.
- Has barbed wire been put on the ridge borders? Not recently, but it should be there. The FWS also intends to implement an access system in which colored cones would be placed on the roofs of authorized cars.
- Is the FWS responsible for basic maintenance? Yes. The FWS has caught poachers, maintains the fence, and has a law enforcement officer. Through partnerships with other fire departments and the Indian tribes the FWS is able to do more with its inadequate budget.
- For which projects is additional funding required? Greg estimated that the FWS needs about 34 positions to perform routine maintenance, arrest poachers, enforce the Archaeological Research Protection Act (ARPA), etc. He reported that the FWS caught an ARPA violator thanks to its partnerships.

**Plutonium Finishing Plant Update**

Mark Sauttman, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB), provided an update on the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) program, with the disclaimer that his presentation reflects his opinions, not the DNFSB's view.

Initially the DNFSB was concerned in February/March because critique frequency increased. There were poor responses to anomalies, issues with procedure, more swing shift and weekend shifts (and thus less management at those times), a perceived management attitude in which workers were being pushed hard, the alarm system had been modified improperly, and there were premature declarations of readiness. DOE-RL and Fluor Hanford shared these concerns.

There have been improvements since February/March. There are still problems with the equipment, but now there are smoother recoveries and more preventative maintenance. The readiness reviews are better, the workers are now more familiar with the processes, and the communication of management's safety expectations has improved. However, areas where improvement is still necessary include emergency response (delays and communication problems), management presence in work area (managers going after crises so they can't be in the work area as much), control of combustibles/housekeeping (major accidents often are fires, so they must make a good effort to housekeep), and minor Conduct of Operations issues

Pete Knollmeyer, DOE-RL, had no exceptions to anything Mark said. He thought there was good alignment between DOE-RL, the contractor, and the DNFSB. DOE-RL has received assurances from Fluor senior management about increased management presence in the field. Mark added that the DOE-RL facility representatives and site representatives had self-identified many of the problems.

**Committee discussion**

- By what percentage have occurrences decreased? Mark Sauttman reported that Conduct of Operations problems are down about 2/3, which is tremendous progress. He added that the work is being performed and there is now good momentum.
- The committee inquired about the problem with the process of drying solids out of magnesium. Mark reported that the super critical fluid extraction was not an acceptable method; other methods may work better. A letter authorizing DOE-RL to authorize using the thermogravimetric method instead has been drafted.

## Spent Nuclear Fuel Update

David Grover, (DNFSB)gave a DNFSB Update on the Spent Nuclear Fuel (SNF) Project. Conduct of Operations was marginal, barely passing the review. There were safety equipment problems and management was just providing quick fixes to problems. Now management is more careful about not putting operators into unfamiliar situations. There are still safety equipment problems but operator knowledge is increasing and procedures are being modified so the incidence of problems decreases. For K-East Fuel Retrieval, there is now parallel project management. Fluor has brought in people with more commercial experience, although it is still unknown whether that transfer will be handled well enough to meet start up schedules. Overall, safety has been improving since 1998. Relative to where the project was 3-4 months ago, there have been substantial improvements, particularly in Conduct of Operations.

- How are engineers working with workers to make corrections? The workers are involved. Also, the new plan is to do routine shut-down and maintenance. Shutting everything down for two weeks every few months should help the equipment last longer.
- Is the DNFSB supportive of the change in moving fuel canisters from K East to K West? It was determined that there was no major safety defects in either option.
- There was a question about how the canisters will be transported. It was believed that trucks could be used, but the DNFSB will be evaluating that and other safety issues as needs arise.

## Spent Nuclear Fuel Management Transition

Mike Schlender, DOE-RL, announced that the Spent Nuclear Fuel (SNF) project is experiencing a management transition. Phil Loscoe is taking on a new role to help develop a Standard of Care across all of DOE-RL. DOE-RL is developing a web-based management system called the Richland Integrated Management System. Steve Veitenheimer will oversee the remainder of SNF team. The next phase of work for SNF

involves focusing on operations and getting the fuel out safely and in time to meet commitments. Mike Schlender thought there should not be many technology challenges, and the project's cost, schedule features, and safety look okay. Phil Loscoe will work with Fluor to see how areas of possible failure can be avoided.

- Where is the project's progress according to the TPA? DOE-RL staff estimated the project was two days ahead of schedule.
- Does "maintaining the budget" include recovering overspent money? Yes. After the baseline change request (BCR), DOE-RL now has confidence in the performance numbers.
- Has the BCR schedule been approved by the regulators? Yes, Ecology and EPA were involved with the changes to the TPA.

## Committee Work Planning

Penny Mabie reminded the committee that to get in touch with DOE staff, issue managers must work through Gail McClure's staff. Dennis Faulk provided the EPA and Ecology points of contact for the committee's issues, but EnviroIssues remains the initial point of contact for Ecology and EPA.

The committee discussed agenda items for an August meeting. Chair Pam Brown tasked issue managers to define policy issues for issues that need it. Pete Knollmeyer requested advice on the groundwater vadose zone, Long Term Stewardship, Canyon Disposition Initiative (CDI) – DOE-RL would like direction to develop a comprehensive plan in those areas. The timeline for this advice is over the next two years. Pete also suggested including agenda items on the DOE-RL management reorganization and work in the Central Plateau. Issue Manager Harold Heacock would like to discuss K Basins at the committee's next meeting; he and Dirk Dunning will meet with the appropriate DOE staff then present an overview to the committee. Doug Sherwood, EPA, reported that EPA is placing most of its emphasis on surface exposures and cleanup of surface areas, but it needs a strategy for groundwater cleanup as well. He noted that a consistent scenario should be developed for eliminating contamination sources, especially in the context of the facility transition for the CDI. Issue managers Shelley Cimon and Gordon Rogers will work on this.

Gail McClure will be out for a few weeks. Committee members were directed to contact Nancy Myers or Kim Ballinger for help.

## Handouts

- River and Plateau Committee Draft Meeting Agenda, June 12, 2001
- River and Plateau Work Planning Table, May 15, 2001
- Hanford Advisory Board: Issue Manager Matrix, May 8, 2001
- Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis "Proposed Cleanup Plan for Hanford's B Reactor Facility," Request for Public Comment by the Tri-Party Agreement Agencies, June 12, 2001

- EPA's 100 Area NPL Section Outline Handout, June 12, 2001
- Draft Responses [from DOE-RL] to HAB RPC Comments on the February 2001 Hanford Waste Management Strategic Plan, June 12, 2001
- Central Plateau Exposure Scenarios Matrix, distributed by DOE-RL, June 12, 2001
- Untitled list of issues relating to the Central Plateau, excerpted from the former HAB Environmental Restoration Committee, January 2001
- List of seven Baseline Assumptions, June 12, 2001
- Letter from Washington State's Secretary of the Interior to the Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, regarding Management of the Hanford Reach National Monument, July 26, 2000
- Map of Hanford Reach National Monument Management Areas (Draft), June 12, 2001

---

## Attendees

### HAB Members and Alternates

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Pam Brown | Madeleine Brown | Shelley Cimon |
| Dirk Dunning | Jim Hagar | Harold Heacock |
| Dave Johnson | Susan Leckband | Maynard Plahuta |
| Gerry Pollet | Wade Riggsbee | Fred Roeck |
| Gordon Rogers | Dan Simpson | John Stanfill |
| Keith Smith | | |

### Others

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Beth Bilson, DOE-RL | Rick Bond, Ecology | Bruce Ford, BHI |
| Briant Charboneau, DOE-RL | Dib Goswani, Ecology | Moses Jarayssi, BHI |
| James Daily, DOE-RL | Jane Hedges, Ecology | Tom Logon, BHI |
| Rudy Garcia, DOE-RL | Fred Jamison, Ecology | Nancy Myers, BHI |
| Stacy Helmann, DOE-RL | John Price, Ecology | Mary Todd, CHI |
| Pete Knollmeyer, DOE-RL | Dennis Faulk, EPA | David Grover, DNFSB |
| Gail McClure, DOE-RL | Larry Gadbois, EPA | Mark Sautman, DNFSB |
| John Morse, DOE-RL | Mike Goldstein, EPA | Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues |
| Mike Schlender, DOE-RL | Doug Sherwood, EPA | Christina Richmond, EnviroIssues |
| Greg Sinton, DOE-RL | Phil Weihrouch, EPA | Barbara Wise, Fluor |
| Mike Schlender, DOE-RL | | Les Davenport, Public |
| | | John Stang, Tri-City Herald |
| | | Tom Cooper, WDOH |